

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this Application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on April 30, 2004. Claims 1-12 are pending in the Application and stand rejected. Claims 1-12 are amended by the present Amendment.

Summarizing the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Udagawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,125, hereinafter "Udagawa") in view of Goto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,106, hereinafter "Goto").

Applicants thank Examiners Yogesh Aggarwal and Ngoc Yen Vu for the courtesy of an interview extended to Applicants' representative on June 9, 2004. During the interview, Amendments to the claims as herein presented were proposed, and arguments as hereinafter developed were presented.

Additionally, the specification, claims and FIGS. 1, 5, and 7 have been amended to correct a minor informality. Specifically, "strobo unit" has been amended to be "strobe unit." No new matter is believed to be added.

It was explained during the interview that Goto uses two power supplies, P2 and P3, to power a piezoelectric device. Under normal operating conditions, power supply P2 powers the piezoelectric device. When the performance of the piezoelectric device powered by P2 is unsatisfactory, a boosting power supplied by power supply P3 is then provided. Among other advantageous features of the present inventions, the piezoelectric element is driven by at least one power accumulating unit or at least one main capacitor.

As indicated on the interview summary (form PTO 413), an agreement was reached that amendment to the independent claims to recite "at least one energy accumulating unit"

would overcome Goto. Independent Claims 1 and 3-12 have been amended to recite either "at least one energy accumulating unit" or "at least one main capacitor."

Based at least on the foregoing discussion and the results of the personal interview, Applicants respectfully submit that the above-summarized rejections are now moot. Their withdrawal is respectfully requested.


In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments to Claims 1-12 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application. Further, the amendments do not raise new issues or require a further search. Finally, if the Examiner determines that the amendments do not place the application in condition for allowance, entry is respectfully requested upon filing of a Notice of Appeal.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-12 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representatives at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Robert T. Pous  
Registration No. 29,099  
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)

I:\ATTY\MQM\18's\197811US\AM.doc